11/14/68 - A.M. - A [illegible] with candidate as an American professor is [illegible] [illegible] who concedes only what he calls "authority"; battles incessantly, ~~too~~ usually unresponsively and unnecessarily. He also lies and misrepresents [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] is by [illegible] entirely unabashed, Thus, when he makes 4 denial (of that a year ago he had gotten over $500,000 from Life) it isn't possible to know whether he got nothing at all like that or $499,999.99, which is not $500,000. He does acknowledge getting more than the $25,000 he mentioned in his testimony and he acknowledges he had before his deposition testimony. But he is satisfied that in saying what was only a down payment he had said enough. He is very concerned about the [illegible] a deposition proposed and finally says it is nobody's business, that if the "authorities" were satisfied, nothing the matters. He felt that anything worded in [illegible] becomes good and ~~[illegible]~~ proper with official knowledge.

He would not allow me to tape.

He slipped from one version of his testimony into another & inconsistent one without visible concern or embarrassment.

Nothing, in fact, embarrassed him. He shows no [illegible] of that feeling.

He readily admitted ~~that~~ having told Max Phillips that the shots had come from behind him & that later on the basis of what he had been told by others (presumably federals) he became aware that ~~the~~ were from in front of him & to his left. First he explained this by saying "they know better than I do"; then by claiming it made no difference because the President was dead anyway.

He is the kind of man who would without qualm say anything asked of him by any "authority" which he also uses instead of "official".

He of course used the Barrett report which he acknowledged having told the N.Y. Times had not happened, & called it "nonsense" and "foolishness." But, like the Phillips & his testimony, he is entirely unconcerned by misrecalling & what amounts to false swearing. Again he asked what difference it made if what he had earlier said & could not have used was in an official report attributed to him.

When I called him to see him he accused me & others of "milking" the assassination. That he got an enormous sum for his pictures whereas I have been without income & have gone into debt to do this work does not concern him. The money he got is not "scavenging," the word he used several times in person after he & we got into an argument, during which I walked out on him.

He is anything but the generous, kindly, unselfish man he presents [illegible] - not only in their money but. While I was with him he got a call apparently from somebody who was [illegible] wanting to be paid off. He told whoever was on the other end of the phone "If they get fired, they get paid; if they quit, they [illegible]."

He claims 'Billings' would have confirmed that Life had paid him about $25,000 a year ago & denied having had any [illegible] an interview with anyone, he would not have said that [illegible] was, that he had gotten $40, [illegible] then. He asked me to call Billings, who said he was no longer with Life [illegible] when I challenged him to call anyone at Life. I told him he had a contract with Life & it would show the basis of payment. He refused to produce it or even quote from it. He became [illegible] & said his lawyer told him he did not have to tell the W.C. how much he got. He insists he "gave" the film to the government, [illegible] he did not sell it to Life, in reality, on the basis that he gave the Life & national SS offices copies before the original left town. He says he then showed Life the original in the office in which he then were. If this is true — and who can tell whether anything he says is — there was then no concern over damage to it by its being shown, the later offered story. From his answer this was prepared at the time of the assassination.

I read him his testimony, that he had sold the rights not to use his film, although one usually gets paid for use, not non-use. He pretended not to know the meaning of his own words, "not use". I then stated both, paying for using & not using it, but he pretended not to understand. Then, apparently not realizing the conflict, he insisted it was his desire that the film not be used.

Not letting anyone see the film

is not suppression – as long as the government has seen it – "authorities"

No one else has any right to, nor has anyone else the right to comment or express opinions.

The Koch said that as long as the false account of the President's murder is official it is perfectly okay for it to be false. Nothing official can be false.

He says he has never read his testimony – only "part" of it (yet it is very short) and has no copy of it.

When I showed him the most important parts of the original were missing he at first denied ~~it~~ it, calling me a liar then again said it made no difference.

He even made out he didn't know Phil Willis! & that he knew nothing of Willis' picture.

He improvised lies of the most transparent, childish deceptions without concern for how utterly ridiculous they were and, having uttered them thusly, seemingly assuring himself that they were true, he seemed so incredulous I would not believe them. There was nothing too impossible for him to utter, nothing too ridiculous for him to expect its unquestioned belief.

In this long interview argument, there was but a single comment I made to which, in answer, he did not manufacture such a response. He had been insisting that writers have no responsibilities or proper [illegible] but rather that the only ones that had meaning were [illegible] when I asked him if he knew of ~~Dreyfus~~ Dreyfus. He said he did. I asked him about Zola, the writer, who had criticized the official injustice of by the authorities. He was silent. I asked what the Dreyfus case did to the Jews of France & elsewhere. He was again silent. No other time was he. He would always mouth some kind of drivel. It finally got so bad I told him straight he should be ashamed of himself, a grown man spewing such nonsense, talking so irresponsibly.

He is almost entirely bald, with a thin fringe of graying hair around the back of his head. He is well tanned; yesterday afternoon he took off to play golf. He is about 55-60, perhaps 5-7 - 5-9, well built but not fat, perhaps 155-160 with a slight accent. He was not cordial when he greeted me at the small (6x8) waiting room into which the ~~steel~~ STEEL door of the private elevator opens, ~~and~~ we had gone half the way into his office before he said he supposed he should offer me his hand, which he did without a smile. He just was not happy to be interviewed and did not hide it.

He did not care that false and misleading testimony had been elicited from him and did not ~~deny~~ deny that he had seen

The President that rather than the Reporters, because, to him, if it is official it is okay & he is not at fault. An annoying mentality! Or leadership lack of it.

I have never, really, met anyone as unconcerned about lies, false swearing, misrepresentations, or so thoroughly persuaded that "authorities" can do no wrong & that whatever they do is right only if because they do it.

Seven hours later it still seems unreal seems that they just could not be as [illegible] [illegible].